

CONFIDENTIAL

24 March 1966

MEMORANDUM No. 1

SUBJECT: Review of External Expression (talks and publication) by Agency employees, 1965 to present

1. The following breakdown is intended to give a rough idea of activity in two categories: a) related to work in CIA and b) not related. The former is called professional, the latter amateur.

	Professional	Amateur	Directorate Totals			
			DDS	DDS&T	DDP	DDI
<u>Talks</u>						
DD/I	17	3				20
DD/P	4	0				4
DDS&T	4	4				8
DD/S	6	2				8
	<u>31</u>	<u>9</u>				
<u>Articles</u>						
DD/I	55	22				77
DD/P	6	27				33
DDS&T	20	2				22
DD/S	3	9				12
	<u>84</u>	<u>60</u>				
<u>Books*</u>						
DD/I	3	1				4
DD/P	0	1				1
DDS&T	1	0				1
DD/S	0	0				0
	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>				
Total	119	71	20	31	38	101
Agency Total						
		190				

* Dissertations for degrees not included unless to be published.

2. Expressed in percentages the distribution of this external activity by category and Directorate is about what one would expect: 60% of it is professional, and of the professional 62% is that of DD/I officers. Again, articles or short pieces constitute the bulk of what is offered for publication. The number of books is quite low.

3. The figures are very misleading in one respect. Fewer employees are involved than the figures might suggest. For example, 44% of all the professional articles attributed to DD/I are the work of two officers in NPIC. An even greater disproportion is true of DDS&T. The number who write for publication in their special fields is so small in relation to the number of professional employees as to be negligible. For the DDI, when one combines serious professional lectures and participation in seminars with potentially authoritative articles on foreign affairs (political and economic) one finds no more than 38 - and these are the work of only 25 people. The repeaters include those who have reputations on the outside, who are in the process of getting them, or are trying to get them. All told, the number of DD/I employees who are active on the outside in a given year and who have any reputation for authoritative scholarship based on professional publication is probably less than 1% of the DD/I analysts employed. How many could deserve reputations given the energy, time and opportunity should be several times this low percentage - but how many times we really do not know.

4. Conclusion:

a) Present Agency policy leaves too much to individual initiative. The present system tends to encourage an ambitious entrepreneur - analyst who is aware of the advantages of access to the Agency's information. He can

1 COPY

1 COPY

1 COPY

CONFIDENTIAL

get a leg up on his academic competitors and then shove off into the sea of fame and fortune. There is no way of closing the door to this opportunity, nor would it be desirable, if feasible, to try negative or ~~positive~~ ~~punitive~~ measures to this end. (We had a celebrated case and gave an unconscionable amount of time and effort to the end of prosecuting him for violation of security. There was no prosecution. The individual is now a famous author and pundit who instructs the U.S. Government in Congressional hearings).

b) If the Agency is to command and hold respect in the learned world it must concern itself more than it has with its employees' potential for scholarly endeavors and must devise ways of making it possible to actualize more of this potential than is presently the case. There is a shortage of qualified and experienced scholar-analysts in the Agency who can be spared from the tactical fronts in intelligence, and we know that we have stiffer competition than ever before in attracting the promising students to our work. Our counsel then should be to provide a better place for scholar-analysts in CIA, one in which they will feel at home in contributing directly to the national intelligence effort without loss of opportunity to gain and maintain the respect and comradeship of their academic colleagues.

c) Agency policy should be such as quietly to assist and encourage those who have developed and who can develop scholarly reputations by publication. The policy would aim to keep those we have and to attract more by a demonstration of quality which commands the respect of teachers and scholars in the universities.



Chief, DDI/Research Staff

25X1